DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 245 333 EA 016 873

AUTHOR Mullin, David D.; Musella, Donald F.
TITLE Educational Consultancy: Perceptions and Reality.
PUB DATE 25 Apr 84
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 23-27, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Consultants; *Consultation Programs; *Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Inservice Education; *Intermediate Administrative Units; *Professional Services; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Ontario

ABSTRACT

This study undertook to discover why educational consultancy has not been more successful in implementing new educational programs and practices. It sought to identify differences in perceptions of superintendents, principals, consultants, and teachers with regard to teachers' need for consultant services and the factors, organizational and otherwise, affecting those services. Educational consultants interact with teachers within an organizational context that may fall on a continuum between a tightly structured "rational bureaucracy" and a loosely coupled structure. For effective consultation, a more tightly coupled organizational structure is advocated. Four large school boards in southern Ontario were chosen for the study, which was based on questionnaires distributed to superintendents, all consultants, and the principals and teaching staff from 15 randomly selected schools. Findings reveal the need for (1) greater input by teachers in the formulation of consultative goals, (2) more knowledge among all key actors about services, (3) employment of more consultants, (4) reduced number of teacher needs for which consultants are responsible, (5) a high priority for beginning teachers in allocating consultant services, (6) reduction in consultants' administrative tasks, and (7) increased inservice training by other classroom teachers. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Donald Musella

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED245333

EDUCATIONAL CONSULTANCY: PERCEPTIONS AND REALITY

David D. Mullin

and

Donald F. Musella

Paper Presented at the AERA Conference
New Orleans, Louisianna

April 25, 1984

EA 016 873

EDUCATIONAL CONSULTANCY: PERCEPTIONS AND REALITY

David D. Mullin
Donald F. Musella

Introduction

Educational change, whether viewed as altering school or classroom programs, teacher practices or teacher attitudes, has engaged researchers for many years. The change process includes a variety of participants, such as ministry officials, school board trustees, administrators, consultants, principals and teachers. Although many experts consider the consultant as a major link in the process (Duncan, 1976; Fullan, 1982; Leithwood, 1982; Partlow, 1972), there is very little thorough research about consultants particularly in their role of facilitating change (Holdaway, 1980; Fullan, 1982). This study focuses on educational consultancy.

Background to the Problem

> In the 1960s educators were busy developing and introducing reforms. In the 1970s they were busy failing at putting them into practice.
> (Fullan, 1982, p. 5)

The successful implementation of a new program or practice at the classroom or school level, was so rare in the 1970s that it was called a "non event" (Charters and Jones, 1973).

A review of the literature on implementation of new programs and new practices indicated a litany of unfilled dreams and broken promises. In the United States, the Rand Corporation's studies, that examined 293 change projects involving twenty-nine field studies of United States federally funded innovations in education costing hundreds of millions of

dollars, indicated that the number of successful implementation projects was small and that many of the successes lacked convincing data (Berman and McLaughlin, 1975). The Texas Research and Development Centers' studies concluded that the implementation process often used in education produces mutant forms of the innovation, or insignificant changes in current programs (Hall and Loucks, 1975).

Implementation of new programs and new practices was also generally unsuccessful in Canada (Fullan, 1975; Fullan and Park, 1981; Leithwood, 1982; Podrebarac, 1982; Russell, 1975; Warner, 1980). Research indicated that many of the projects which had been initially deemed to be successful were either in the long run, or through further investigation, found to be less than successful. For example, the Ford Foundation lighthouse projects were often assessed as failures because innovations routinely disappeared at some stage during the implementation. Other changes were frequently only cosmetic in nature (Berman and McLaughlin, 1975), or new labels adopted for old practices in implementation (Goodlad and Klein, 1970).

Statement of the Problem

The problem researched in this study was the essential differences in the perceptions of teachers, principals, consultants and superintendents regarding consultative services.

Experts are consistent in their views that implementation strategies for change in order to be successful must include a strong professional development component (Berman and McLaughlin, 1975; Fullan and Park, 1981; Leithwood and Montgomery, 1982). Dr. Podrebarac, while he was Assistant Deputy Minister of Education for the Province of Ontario, indicated in a conversation with this researcher, that he perceived consultants to be an

important component in the process of transforming ministry policy into classroom practice.

> "Effective implementation involves the development of individual and organizational meaning vis-a-vis a particular change."
> (Fullan, 1982, p. 188)

> "In-service professional development, based on the needs of the professionals involved, is a powerful tool for change."
> (Partners in Action, 1982, p. 18)

In the development of the problem for this study, the researchers worked from the assumption that it was a generally held perception by the key actors involved in educational consultancy, namely, superintendents, principals, consultants and teachers, that a part, if not all, of a consultant's role was to help teachers implement new programs and new practices.

This assumption included the view that this perception about consultants by the key actors was a basis for the hiring, directing and utilizing of consultative services.

Common sense indicated that the use of consultants in implementing change should be more successful than it was.

Building on the assumption that the actors involved in implementation perceived that consultants had a prominent role to play in the change process, and building on the conclusion that consultants were generally competent teachers, led to the question of "Why wasn't there more evidence of successful implementation of new programs or new practices?"

A survey of the literature revealed that the impact of consultants in implementing new programs and new practices was minimal, and that there were a variety of possible causes for this ineffectiveness. This then led to the main problem of the study.

If consultants were an important link in any implementation strategy, if implementation was a "non event," if the literature indicated that changes were needed in the type and/or style of delivery of consultative services to schools, then why were there not major changes in the practice of educational consultancy.

If consultants needed their role clarified, why wasn't it? If consultants needed specialized training on being a consultant, why didn't they receive it? If the delivery procedure for consultative services (generally on a call procedure) was not utilized, why wasn't it changed? In summary, if the status quo for consultative services was not effective, why was it maintained?

In this study, the researchers sought to find out the essential differences in perceptions of educational consultancy held by the key actors, namely, superintendents, principals, consultants and teachers.

Objectives

- to identify differences in perceptions of key actors about the needs of teachers for consultant services
- to identify differences in perceptions of key actors about the factors affecting consultant services for teachers
- to add to the body of knowledge regarding coupling theory and implications for theory and practice regarding curriculum change
- to provide partial solutions to curriculum implementation problems.

Definition of Educational Consultancy

Educational consultancy in this study was defined as the organization process within school boards by which consultants provided consultative services to teachers.

Review of the Literature

The present day consultant evolved from the role model of the supervisor. In the early 1900s, the supervisor's role was to inspect schools and classrooms to ensure compliance to an established set of objectives. By the 1950s, the acceptance of the teacher as a professional had become entrenched, and thus consequently, supervisors became more of helpers than of inspectors. It was in this time frame that the term consultant was adopted both in the literature and in practice, in an attempt to erase the legacy of inspection that had become synonymous with the title supervisor (Wiles, 1950; Winter, 1979).

In the 1960s and 1970s, the consultative role had two thrusts (Burnham and King, 1961; Crandall, 1977; Ferguson, 1972). The first, as an expert, and the second, as a facilitator. In the 1980s, researchers suggest that an effective consultant has skills in both thrusts (Fullan, 1982).

The evolution of the role of consultant resulted in an increased participation in the change process of schools and school systems. The literature on the change process emphasized the importance of professional development, and of the role of the consultant (Fullan and Park, 1981). Without professional development, lasting change was unlikely. In facilitating change in classrooms, consultants need to help teachers to:

(a) use new materials

(b) use new teaching approaches

(c) alter beliefs.

Educational consultancy in its interaction with teachers works within an organizational structure. Theorists have developed a wide range of images for the examination and understanding of organizations. Two systems,

the rational bureaucracy (rational system) and the loosely coupled system (natural system) are applicable to the educational arena. The rational bureaucracy is a formally organized structure with clearly defined patterns of activities in which every series of actions is functionally related to the goals of the organization. A loosely coupled system is a structure where goals are ambiguous, hierarchies of authority are not effective integration mechanisms, technologies are unclear and participation is fluid. The recent literature suggests that school systems are not an absolute of one system (rational bureaucracy), or the other (loosely coupled), but rather a blend of the two. There were three views in how a system can blend the two images:

(a) placement on a continuum with one pole being a rational bureaucracy and the other a loosely coupled system

(b) a variety of structures within the organization whereby some sub-units are loosely coupled, and others are tightly coupled (rational bureaucracy)

(c) participants within the organization being tightly coupled for some purposes and loosely coupled for others.

Four major characteristics which help distinguish between organizations that are either a rational bureaucracy or loosely coupled were identified as:

(a) clarity of organizational goals

(b) degree of goal consensus by participants

(c) purpose of monitoring by managers

(d) extent of feedback.

The literature did not place a value on coupleness by or within an organization. For example, loose coupling might be, depending upon the environment in which it operated either a useful or hindering structure.

In the particular structure of educational consultancy, much of the recent literature clearly revealed and advocated for a more tightly coupled structure.

Research Questions, Design and Procedures

Primary Question 1

What are the different perceptions among the key actors about the needs of teachers for consultative services?

(a) How do the key actors differ in their perceptions of the relative importance of teacher needs?

(b) How do the key actors differ in their perception of the extent of responsibility of consultants in meeting the identified teacher needs?

(c) How do the key actors differ in their perceptions of the amount of time consultants spend meeting teacher needs?

Primary Question 2

What are the different perceptions among the key actors about factors affecting consultative services for teachers?

(a) How do the key actors differ in their perception about the extent of expectations held for consultants?

(b) How do the key actors differ in their perceptions about the dependency of the role performance of consultants on the incumbency of superintendents and principals?

(c) How do the key actors differ in their perceptions for how knowledgeable they and the other key actor groups are about what consultative services are available to teachers?

(d) How do the key actors differ in their perception about the establishment of goals/objectives for consultants?

(e) How do the perceptions of the key actors differ in their perception of the monitoring and feedback of consultants' performance?

Sample Population of the Study

Four large school boards in Southern Ontario, two public and two separate, were chosen as the sample boards. In choosing the sample for this study, the researcher had three purposes in mind:

(a) provision for size of sample of superintendents, principals, consultants and teachers which would yield statistically significant data;

(b) reasonable proximity to Mississauga to facilitate the collection of data;

(c) differences between/among boards:

(i) size: large or very large
(ii) type: separate or public
(iii) locale: urban or urban/rural.

Board A is a separate board with an elementary school population of over 30,000 pupils. The board is one of the few boards in Ontario with a growing pupil population. It is a large urban board with rural components.

Board B is a separate board with an elementary school population of over 90,000 pupils. Enrollment in this board is stabilized, although it does have pockets of both slight decline and sharp growth. Board B is entirely an urban board.

Board C is a public board with an elementary school population of over 25,000 pupils. Enrollment in this board is slightly declining. Board C is an urban rural board. The overall pattern of size of schools within this board indicated smaller schools when compared to the other boards in the sample.

Board D is a public board with an elementary school population of over 50,000 pupils. This board, although not suffering from declining enrollments on the whole, has specific areas that are currently in sharp decline. Board D is a very large urban board with rural components.

For each board, all superintendents who had jurisdiction over consultants (as defined by this study) were surveyed. This included superintendents with such titles as superintendent of schools, area superintendent and superintendent of program.

All consultants from each board were surveyed.

The principals and all teaching staff from fifteen randomly selected schools in each board were surveyed.

Data Collection

Questionnaires were administered to superintendents, principals, consultants, and teachers by trained data collectors. The percentage of returns was high: teachers (92%), consultants (67%), principals (98%), and superintendents (67%). (See Table 1.)

Insert Table 1 here

Findings

The data from the questionnaires were analyzed via an "F" ratio and the Scheffe procedure, as well as Kendall tau rank correlation. A series of subquestions and subsequent null hypothesis were developed for each of the two primary research questions. The first primary research question is:

> What are the different perceptions among the key actors about the needs of teachers for consultative services?

The following are the findings pertaining to the teacher needs:

1. the key actor groups held different perceptions regarding the relative importance of the teacher needs (see Tables 2, 3 and 4);

2. the key actor groups held different perceptions regarding the extent of responsibility of consultants in meeting teacher needs (see Tables 5, 6, 7 and 8).

3. the key actor groups held different perceptions regarding the amount of time consultants spent in meeting teacher needs (see Tables 9, 10, 11 and 12).

The second primary research question is:

What are the different perceptions among the key actors about factors affecting consultative services for teachers?

The following are the findings pertaining to factors affecting consultative services:

1. the key actor groups held different expectations for consultative services (see Table 13);

2. the key actor groups held different perceptions about the extent of interdependencies of key actors and consultative services;

3. the key actor groups held similar perceptions on how knowledgeable the key actor groups were about what kinds of consultative services were available to teachers;

4. the key actor groups held different perceptions about the goals/objectives for consultative services;

5. the key actor groups held different perceptions about the monitoring/feedback process of consultative services.

Teacher Needs

For the purpose of discussion, the twenty-three identified teacher needs were regrouped into nine composite needs:

1. Ministry Guidelines
2. School Board Guidelines
3. Instructional Materials and Resources
4. Classroom Management
5. Teaching Techniques
6. Feedback on Teaching
7. Testing
8. Discussion of Problems
9. Other.

A discussion of the composite teacher needs based on the findings presented above led to the following conclusions:

1. Consultants are not expected to observe and provide feedback to teachers on their classroom performances;

2. Consultants are not expected to be a forum for teachers to discuss their personal problems;

3. Consultants are expected to help teachers with diagnostic testing, but not with standardized testing;

4. The composite needs of school board guidelines, ministry guidelines, instructional materials and resources, classroom management and teaching techniques were all both important to teachers and a significant part of a consultant's responsibility;

5. School board guidelines were perceived to be more of a consultant's responsibility than were ministry guidelines;

6. Consultants held the most responsibility for the needs most important to teachers, and the least responsibility for needs that were the least important to teachers;

7. Only one need, obtaining materials and resources, was perceived by all key actor groups to have received at least an average amount of consultative time;

8. Only superintendents perceived that ministry guidelines received at least an average amount of consultative time;

9. There was a wide variance in the perceptions held by the various key actor groups about the amount of time consultants spent meeting teacher needs;

10. Consultants were perceived to spend the most time with the needs on which they held the greatest responsibility.

Factors Affecting Consultative Services

The following are the conclusions about the factors affecting consultative services based on the findings:

Expectations

1. Teachers with 0-2 years experience are expected to receive more consultative servicing than other teachers. Teachers with 5 or more years of experience are expected to receive the least;

2. Primary teachers are generally expected to receive more servicing than junior or intermediate teachers;

3. Teachers have a choice in whether they wish to utilize consultative services.

Interdependencies

1. Consultants perceived that teachers had more influence on consultative performances than did the other key actor groups.

Knowledge

1. Superintendents were perceived as being knowledgeable about consultative services;

2. Principals were perceived as having some knowledge about consultative services;

3. Teachers were perceived as having less than average knowledge about what consultative services are available to them.

Goals/Objectives

1. The majority of key actors who had information on whether or not goals/objectives were established indicated that they perceived that goals/objectives were established;

2. Superintendents were perceived as the key actor group having the most influence in the development of consultative goals/objectives;

3. Teachers were perceived as the key actor group having the least influence in the development of consultative goals/objectives.

Monitoring/Feedback

1. A strong majority of the key actors responded that the performances of the consultants were monitored;

2. Superintendents were perceived to do the most monitoring and teachers were perceived to do the least;

3. Consultants and the other key actor groups differed in their perception of what key actor groups give the most and the least amount of feedback to consultants about their performance. Consultants indicated that teachers give the most feedback and superintendents the least. However, the other key actor groups held the opposite view. They perceived that the superintendents gave the most feedback, and the teachers the least.

Goals for Consultative Services

All key actor groups perceived that superintendents do, to more than a large extent, influence the establishment and changing of consultative goals/objectives. Further, all key actor groups perceived that superintendents were the most influential key actor group in the establishment and changing of consultative goals/objectives.

All key actor groups perceived that principals and consultants had more than some influence on the goals of educational consultancy.

In the case of teachers, all key actor groups perceived that teachers had less than some influence in the establishment of consultative goals. Teachers (mean 2.81) and principals, (mean 2.51) perceived teachers as having less than some influence in the changing of consultative goals. However, superintendents (mean 3.33) and consultants (mean 3.18) perceived that teachers had more than some influence. In spite of the discrepancy which exists between superintendents and consultants, and principals and teachers, all key actor groups perceived that in comparison to the other key actor groups, teachers had the least influence in the establishment and in the changing of consultative goals/objectives.

Implications for Practice

The researchers in this study have shown that teachers have indicated that they receive little consultative service in meeting their needs. If

the importance of professional development of teachers is as necessary an ingredient in the change process as advocated in the literature, and is supported by the administrators in school boards, the data seem to indicate that changes must be made to the present practice of educational consultancy. The following changes are presented for examination and discussion by school boards:

(a) facilitate greater input by teachers in the formulation of consultative goals;

(b) provide all key actors, especially teachers, with knowledge about the services of educational consultants;

(c) employ more consultants;

(d) reduce the number of teacher needs for which consultants hold responsibility;

(e) direct consultants to provide services to the teachers who have the highest priority (beginning teachers);

(f) reduce the number of administrative tasks and assignments given to consultants;

(g) increase use of other sources, such as classroom teachers, for in-servicing teachers.

Superintendents, the key actors who are perceived by all key actors as having the most influence in the formulation of consultative goals, hold the perception that the needs of teachers are generally being met. Since the information the superintendents hold about the amount of time consultants spend meeting teacher needs is quite different from what teachers reported as actually happens, the conclusion is drawn that the monitoring/feedback process is either flawed or that no change is desired. The consequence of this discrepancy in perceptions is that superintendents who perceive that educational consultancy is working maintain--the status quo. Teachers on the other hand, are frustrated by the apparent lack of effort on the part

of administration to make adjustment to a system which to them, is obviously not meeting their needs.

In summary, the findings of this study have shown that the key actor groups involved in educational consultancy namely, teachers, principals, consultants and superintendents, generally hold different perceptions about the amount of time consultants spent meeting teacher needs, and about the factors affecting consultative services. Teachers in particular, indicated that they received minimal consultative service for many of the identified needs. Further, teachers perceived that they had little knowledge about, and little input into, the system of educational consultancy. If the trend of continual failure in the attempts to cause lasting change in teacher programs practices and attitudes is to be reversed, then changes are first necessary in the system of educational consultancy--the status quo cannot remain.

REFERENCES

Berman, P., and McLaughlin, M. W. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change. Vol. 4. The Findings in Review. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1975.

Burnham, R. M., and King, M. L. Supervision in Action. Washington, D.C.: ASCD. 1961.

Charters, W. W., and Jones, J. "On the Risk of Appraising Non-Events in Program Evaluation," Educational Researcher, 1973, 2(11), 5-7.

Crandall, D. "Training and Supporting Linking Agents." In Linking Processes in Educational Improvement. Edited by N. Nash and J. Culbertson. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1977.

Duncan, L. "Role and Responsibility of Social Studies Consultants in 10 Selected Public Districts in Colorado." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1975.

Fullan, M. The Meaning of Educational Change. Toronto: OISE Press, 1982.

Fullan, M., and Park, P. Curriculum Implementation: A Resource Booklet. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education, 1981.

Goodlad, J., Klein, M., and Associates. Behind the Classroom Door. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones, 1970.

Hall, G., and Loucks, S. "A Developmental Model for Determining Whether the Treatment is Actually Implemented." American Educational Research Journal, 1977, 14(3), 263-76.

Holdaway, E. A. (Ed.). "Educational Consultation: A Summary of Four Alberta Studies." Alberta Journal of Educational Review, 1980, 26(3), 194-210.

Leithwood, K. A., and Montgomery, D. J. "A Framework for Planned Change: Application to the Assessment of Program Implementation." Unpublished manuscript, OISE, 1981.

Partlow, H. R. "The Consultant--A Liberating Force." Unpublished manuscript, North York Board of Education, September, 1972.

Podrebarac, G. R. "Practitioners' Perceptions of Curriculum Implementation." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, 1982.

Werner, W. "Implementation: The Role of Belief." Unpublished paper, Center for Curriculum Studies, University of British Columbia, 1980.

Wiles, K. Supervision for Better Schools. New York: Harper & Row, 1950.

Winter, C. F. "Conceptualizing the Practice of Educational Consultancy from the Perspective of Curriculum and Instruction." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, 1979.

Table 1

RATE OF RETURN BY KEY ACTOR AND BY BOARD

Key Actor	Questionnaire	Board A	Board B	Board C	Board D	Total
Superintendent	Sent	5	10	17	13	45
	Returned	4	5	11	10	30
	Rate of Return	80%	50%	65%	77%	66.6%
Principal	Sent	15	15	15	15	60
	Returned	15	15	14	15	59
	Rate of Return	100%	100%	93%	100%	98%
Consultant	Sent	30	21	54	47	152
	Returned	25	18	33	43	119
	Rate of Return	83%	86%	61%	91%	78%
Teacher	Sent	285	180	260	250	975
	Returned	270	161	231	236	898
	Rate of Return	95%	89%	89%	94%	92%

Table 2

LIST OF TEACHER NEEDS

TEACHER NEED NUMBER	TEACHER NEED
1	Receiving Ministry Curriculum Guidelines
2	Explanation of Ministry Curriculum Guidelines
3	Having Available Support Documents Based on Ministry Curriculum Guidelines
4	Explanation of Support Documents Based on Ministry Curriculum Guidelines
5	Receiving School Board Curriculum Guidelines
6	Explanation of School Board Curriculum Guidelines
7	Having Available Support Documents Based on School Board Curriculum Guidelines
8	Explanation of Support Documents Based on School Board Curriculum Guidelines
9	Obtaining Instructional Materials and Resources
10	Help with Classroom Organization
11	Help with Long Range Planning
12	Help with Unit Planning
13	Demonstrations in Teaching Techniques with Respect to Curriculum Materials
14	Demonstrations in Teaching Techniques with Respect to Specific Kinds of Learners
15	Observation and Feedback about Classroom Teaching
16	Receiving Information about the School System
17	Help with Diagnostic Testing of Children
18	Help with Standardized Testing
19	Opportunity to Discuss Professional Problems
20	Opportunity to Discuss Personal Problems
21	Help In Meeting with Individual Parents
22	Help In Meeting with Community Workers
23	Help with Supervision on Excursions

Table 3

KEY ACTOR GROUP MEANS FOR THE PERCEPTION OF THE IMPORTANCE OF EACH OF THE IDENTIFIED TEACHER NEEDS

Teacher Need #	Teacher Mean	Principal Mean	Consultant Mean	Superintendent Mean
1	4.10	4.23	4.14	4.12
2	4.01	4.23	4.22	4.16
3	3.97	4.38	4.22	4.41
4	3.75	4.25	4.06	4.20
5	4.59	4.81	4.73	4.75
6	4.37	4.71	4.67	4.58
7	4.27	4.57	4.51	4.58
8	4.07	4.47	4.47	4.54
9	4.67	4.70	4.47	4.25
10	3.41	4.06	4.00	3.87
11	3.47	4.03	3.91	3.75
12	3.46	3.91	3.99	3.87
13	3.53	3.79	3.73	3.79
14	4.05	4.15	3.80	4.37
15	3.58	4.08	3.73	4.33
16	3.39	3.29	3.24	3.58
17	4.07	4.05	3.84	4.25
18	3.61	3.40	3.09	3.70
19	3.97	4.18	4.13	4.16
20	2.61	3.44	3.20	3.60
21	3.16	3.50	3.20	3.58
22	2.90	3.05	2.94	3.20
23	3.36	2.83	2.79	3.00

LEGEND: Very Important 5 Important 4 Of Some Importance 3
Of Small Importance 2 Of No Importance 1

Table 4

SUMMARY OF STATISTICALLY DIFFERENT MEANS (.050 LEVEL)

AMONG KEY ACTOR GROUPS REGARDING THE PERCEPTION

OF THE IMPORTANCE OF EACH TEACHER NEED

TEACHER NEED	SUPT. PRIN.	SUPT.& CONS.	SUPT.& TEACH.	PRIN.& CONS.	PRIN.& TEACH.	TEACH.& CONS.
1						
2						
3					X	
4					X	
5						
6					X	X
7						X
8					X	X
9	X		X			X
10					X	X
11					X	X
12					X	X
13						
14						
15			X		X	
16						
17						
18						X
19						
20			X		X	X
21						
22						
23					X	X

Note: Means are indicated (by an X) for needs where one key actor group mean is statistically different from one or more key actor group means.

Legend:

Very Important	5	Of Small Importance	2
Important	4	Of No Importance	1
Of Some Importance	3		

Table 5

KEY ACTOR GROUP MEANS FOR THE PERCEIVED EXTENT OF CONSULTANT RESPONSIBILITY IN MEETING EACH OF THE IDENTIFIED TEACHER NEEDS

Teacher Need #	Teacher Mean	Principal Mean	Consultant Mean	Superintendent Mean
1	3.26	2.96	2.94	3.00
2	3.39	3.49	3.58	3.50
3	3.42	3.49	3.31	3.29
4	3.41	3.61	3.58	3.62
5	3.74	3.91	3.59	3.73
6	3.74	4.13	4.06	4.08
7	3.81	4.11	3.81	3.97
8	3.73	4.06	4.00	4.29
9	3.76	3.32	3.53	3.45
10	2.98	3.03	3.39	3.62
11	2.97	3.17	3.50	3.58
12	3.12	3.37	3.56	3.70
13	3.42	3.66	3.62	3.87
14	3.55	3.67	3.50	3.91
15	2.43	1.93	2.54	2.56
16	2.79	2.35	2.55	2.47
17	3.23	2.91	2.87	3.41
18	2.99	2.61	2.49	3.00
19	2.87	2.94	3.29	3.16
20	1.49	1.62	2.39	2.04
21	1.92	1.98	2.39	2.62
22	2.14	2.11	2.47	2.41
23	1.54	1.37	1.81	1.52

LEGEND: Totally Responsible 5 Mostly Responsible 4
Some Responsibility 3 Small Degree of Responsibility 2
No Responsibility 1

Table 6

SUMMARY OF STATISTICALLY DIFFERENT MEANS (.050 LEVEL) AMONG KEY ACTOR GROUPS REGARDING THE PERCEPTION OF THE EXTENT OF CONSULTANT RESPONSIBILITY IN MEETING EACH TEACHER NEED

TEACHER NEED	SUPT.& PRIN.	SUPT.& CONS.	SUPT.& TEACH.	PRIN.& CONS.	PRIN.& TEACH.	TEACH.& CONS.
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6					X	X
7						
8						
9					X	
10			X			X
11			X			X
12			X			X
13						
14						
15				X	X	
16						
17						X
18						X
19						X
20			X	X		X
21			X			X
22					X	X
23				X		

Note: Means are indicated (by an X) for needs where one key actor group mean is statistically different from one or more key actor group means.

Legend:

Totally Responsibile	5	Small Degree of Responsibility	2
Mostly Responsible	4	No Responsibility	1
Some Responsibility	3		

Table 7

RANKING OF MEANS OF PERCEPTION HELD BY EACH KEY ACTOR GROUP REGARDING THE RESPONSIBILITY OF CONSULTANT IN MEETING EACH TEACHER NEED

RANK =1	TEACHER NEED	BY TEACHER	TEACHER NEED	BY PRIN.	TEACHER NEED	BY CONS'LT	TEACHER NEED	BY SUPT
1	7	3.81	6	4.13	6	4.06	8	4.29
2	9	3.76	7	4.11	8	4.00	6	4.08
3	5	3.74	8	4.06	7	3.81	14	3.91
4	6	3.74	5	3.91	13	3.62	13	3.87
5	8	3.73	14	3.67	5	3.59	7	3.87
6	14	3.55	13	3.66	2	3.58	5	3.73
7	3	3.42	4	3.61	4	3.56	12	3.70
8	4	3.41	2	3.49	12	3.56	10	3.62
9	13	3.41	3	3.49	9	3.53	4	3.62
10	2	3.39	12	3.37	14	3.50	11	3.58
11	1	3.26	9	3.32	11	3.50	2	3.50
12	17	3.23	11	3.17	10	3.39	9	3.45
13	12	3.12	10	3.03	3	3.31	17	3.41
14	18	2.99	1	2.96	19	3.29	3	3.29
15	10	2.98	19	2.94	1	2.94	19	3.16
16	11	2.97	17	2.91	17	2.87	18	3.00
17	19	2.87	18	2.61	16	2.55	1	3.00
18	16	2.79	16	2.35	15	2.54	21	2.62
19	15	2.43	22	2.11	18	2.49	15	2.56
20	22	2.14	21	1.98	22	2.47	16	2.47
21	21	1.92	15	1.93	20	2.39	22	2.41
22	20	1.49	20	1.62	21	2.39	20	2.04
23	23	1.54	23	1.37	23	1.81	23	1.52

LEGEND: Totally Responsible 5 Mostly Responsible 4
Some Responsibility 3 Small Degree of Responsibility 2
No Responsibility

Table 8

KENDALL RANK-ORDER CORRELATION (tau)

CONSULTANT RESPONSIBILITY BY KEY ACTOR GROUPS

	Teacher	Principal	Consultant	Superintendent
Teacher		+ .376	+ .356	+ .162
Principal			+ .312	+ .372
Consultant				+ .233

Table 9

KEY ACTOR GROUP MEANS FOR THE PERCEPTION OF THE AMOUNT OF CONSULTANT TIME SPENT MEETING EACH IDENTIFIED TEACHER NEED

Teacher Need #	Teacher Mean	Principal Mean	Consultant Mean	Superintendent Mean
1	1.89	2.34	2.62	2.65
2	1.93	2.66	3.03	3.62
3	2.04	2.72	2.85	3.17
4	1.96	2.88	3.01	3.57
5	2.60	3.63	3.52	3.63
6	2.60	3.89	3.92	4.04
7	2.64	3.79	3.66	3.65
8	2.52	3.74	3.80	4.12
9	3.03	3.47	3.86	3.33
10	2.11	3.08	3.56	3.62
11	2.02	3.00	3.35	3.50
12	2.19	3.32	3.52	3.50
13	2.23	3.00	3.47	3.37
14	2.06	2.86	3.20	3.29
15	1.71	1.93	2.38	2.30
16	1.80	2.17	2.52	2.34
17	2.09	2.59	2.88	3.04
18	1.92	2.08	2.29	2.70
19	2.12	2.98	3.33	3.00
20	1.31	1.77	2.43	2.08
21	1.52	2.03	2.35	2.50
22	1.44	1.89	2.25	2.37
23	1.33	1.57	1.74	1.79

LEGEND: Extensive 5 Significant 4 Some 3 Minimal 2 None 1

Table 10

SUMMARY OF STATISTICALLY DIFFERENT MEANS (.050 LEVEL) AMONG KEY ACTOR GROUPS REGARDING THE PERCEPTION OF THE AMOUNT OF TIME SPENT BY CONSULTANTS IN MEETING EACH TEACHER NEED

TEACHER NEED	SUPT.'S PRIN.	SUPT.'S CONS.	SUPT.'S TEACH.	PRIN.'S CONS.	PRIN.'S TEACH.	TEACH.'S CONS.
1			X		X	X
2			X		X	X
3			X		X	X
4	X		X		X	X
5			X		X	X
6			X		X	X
7			X		X	X
8			X		X	X
9					X	X
10			X	X	X	X
11			X		X	X
12			X		X	X
13			X		X	X
14			X		X	X
15			X		X	X
16			X		X	X
17			X		X	X
18			X		X	X
19			X		X	X
20			X		X	X
21			X		X	X
22			X		X	X
23			X			X

Note: Means are indicated (by an X) for needs where one key actor group mean is statistically different from one or more key actor group means.

Legend:

Extensive	5	Minimal	2
Significant	4	None	1
Some	3		

Table 11

RANKING OF MEANS OF PERCEPTION HELD BY EACH KEY ACTOR GROUP REGARDING THE AMOUNT OF TIME CONSULTANTS SPENT IN MEETING EACH TEACHER NEED

RANK #1	TEACHER NEED	BY TEACHER	TEACHER NEED	BY PRIN.	TEACHER NEED	BY CONS'LT	TEACHER NEED	BY SUPT
1	9	3.03	6	3.89	6	3.92	8	4.12
2	7	2.64	7	3.79	9	3.86	6	4.04
3	5	2.60	9	3.74	8	3.80	7	3.65
4	6	2.60	5	3.63	7	3.66	5	3.63
5	8	2.52	9	3.47	10	3.56	10	3.62
6	13	2.23	12	3.32	5	3.52	4	3.57
7	12	2.19	10	3.08	12	3.52	11	3.50
8	19	2.12	11	3.00	13	3.47	12	3.50
9	10	2.11	13	3.00	11	3.35	13	3.37
10	17	2.09	19	2.98	19	3.33	9	3.33
11	14	2.06	4	2.88	14	3.20	14	3.29
12	3	2.04	14	2.86	2	3.03	2	3.26
13	11	2.02	3	2.72	4	3.01	3	3.17
14	4	1.96	2	2.66	17	2.88	17	3.04
15	2	1.93	17	2.59	3	2.85	19	3.00
16	18	1.92	1	2.34	1	2.62	18	2.70
17	1	1.89	16	2.17	16	2.52	1	2.65
18	16	1.80	18	2.08	20	2.43	21	2.50
19	15	1.71	21	2.03	15	2.38	22	2.37
20	21	1.52	15	1.93	21	2.35	16	2.34
21	22	1.44	22	1.89	18	2.29	15	2.30
22	23	1.31	20	1.77	22	2.25	20	2.08
23	20	1.31	23	1.57	23	1.74	23	1.79

LEGEND: Extensive 5 Signigicant 4 Some 3 Minimal 2 None 1

Table 12

KENDALL RANK-ORDER CORRELATION (tau) OF PERCEPTION OF TIME SPENT BY CONSULTANTS BY KEY ACTOR GROUPS

	Teacher	Principal	Consultant	Superintendent
Teacher		+ .257	+ .419	+ .474
Principal			+ .443	+ .300
Consultant				+ .463

Table 13

KEY ACTOR GROUPS MEANS FOR THE PERCEPTION OF THE EXTENT OF EXPECTATIONS FOR CONSULTATIVE SERVICES

	Superintendent Mean	Principal Mean	Consultant Mean	Teacher Mean
EXPECTATIONS				
To what extent are consultants expected to help teachers?	4.47	4.16	4.59	3.64
To what extent are consultants expected to work with teachers who have not requested their help?	2.78	2.55	2.88	2.30
To what extent are you expected to follow the advice given to you by consultants?	3.82	3.30	3.21	2.89
To what extent do you expect consultants to work with you before and after class hours?	3.68	3.33	3.89	2.88

LEGEND: To a Very Great Extent 5 To a Large Extent 4
To Some Extent 3 To a Small Extent 2 Not at All 1